

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed January 29, 2004, the Examiner noted that claims 29 were pending and rejected all claims. Claims 1, 8, 10, 18, 19 and 29 have been amended, new claims 30-32 have been added and, thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-32 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected all claims variously under 35 U.S.C. section 102 or 103 over Kulakowski and/or Nakaya.

Kulakowski discusses a system that inhibits power consuming applications, such as an automatic back-up task, when a lap-top computer is operating on an internal power supply as compared not inhibiting the tasks when operation on an external power supply.

Nakaya discusses a system for a portable terminal in which the power consumption is reduced by manually selecting to reduce the frame rate of an animation image operation. That is, the quality of the image is reduced to reduce power consumption by skipping over animation frames.

In contrast, the present invention not only reduces a load of the processor or performs a process for a light processing load in the processor when in the battery mode but does so automatically. In addition and importantly, the present invention automatically reduces the clock speed of the CPU (see claims 1, 9, 10, 18 and 29-32). Thus, the present invention achieves a level of power use reduction that combines load reduction and clock speed reduction. This higher level of power reduction or reduction in consumption is not achieved by the prior art. As a result, a battery in a lap-top computer will last longer using the present invention than when using the prior art. For this reason, the present invention is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Further, the present invention reduces the clock speed in correspondence to the reduction in load or the throughput required of the CPU (see claims 1, 9, 10, 18, 29, 30 and 32). This allows the present invention to adapt to the processing needs and reduce power consumption as is needed. The prior art does not teach much less suggest this. For this additional reason, the present invention is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Claim 19 emphasizes performing an operation in response to the throughput required of the CPU. As noted above, the prior art performs operations in response to internal or external

power supply availability. Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests the features of claim 19. For this reason, the invention of claim 19 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

The dependent claims depend from the above-discussed independent claims and are patentable over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. The dependent claims also recite additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. For example, claim 6 calls for substituting a another process that accomplishes the same function as a heavy load process. Nothing in the prior art teaches or suggests this. It is submitted that the dependent claims are independently patentable over the prior art.

It is submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

5/21/4

By:

J. Randall Beckers
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501